arXiv:1607.04233v5 [math.CO] 20 Mar 2017

Circuit partitions and signed interlacement in 4-regular graphs

Lorenzo Traldi
Lafayette College
Easton, Pennsylvania 18042

Abstract

Let F be a 4-regular graph. Each circuit partition P of F has a corresponding touch-graph $Tch(P)$; the circuits in P correspond to vertices of $Tch(P)$, and the vertices of F correspond to edges of $Tch(P)$. We discuss the connection between modified versions of the interlacement matrix of an Euler system of F and the cycle space of $Tch(P)$, over $GF(2)$ and $\mathbb{R}$.

Keywords. 4-regular graph, circuit partition, cycle space, Euler system, interlacement

Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C50

1 Introduction

The graphs in this paper are multigraphs; loops and parallels are allowed. The open neighborhood of a vertex v is denoted $N(v)$; $v \notin N(v)$ whether or not v is looped. In order to make sure that every edge has two distinct orientations it is convenient to think of an edge as consisting of two distinct half-edges, each incident on one vertex; a direction is given by designating one half-edge as initial and the other as terminal. The degree of a vertex is the number of incident half-edges, and a d-regular graph is one whose vertices all have degree d.

A walk in a graph is a sequence $W = v_1, h_1, h'_1, v_2, ..., v_k, h_k, h'_k, v_{k+1}$ such that for each i, h_{i+1} and h'_i are half-edges incident on v_{i+1}, and h_i and h'_i are the half-edges of an edge e_i. A closed walk has $v_1 = v_{k+1}$. If $e_i \neq e_j$ when $i \neq j \in \{1, ..., k\}$ then the walk is a trail; and if $v_i \neq v_j$ when $i \neq j$ and $\{i, j\} \neq \{1, k+1\}$, then the trail is a path. We use the term *circuit* to

refer to a closed trail; a closed path is a minimal circuit. (Some references agree with this usage, but others use "circuit" only for a closed path.) Note that a walk is specified by a list of half-edges, so even if it is a loop it has a preferred orientation; we do not consider it the same walk if the preferred orientation is reversed. However we do consider two closed walks to be the same if they differ only by a cyclic permutation. That is, if $v_1 = v_{k+1}$ then v_1, h_1, h'_1, v_2, ..., v_k, h_k, h'_k, v_{k+1} and v_i, h_i, h'_i, v_{i+1}, ..., h'_k, $v_{k+1} = v_1$, h_1, ..., h'_{i-1}, v_i determine the same closed walk. An Euler circuit is a circuit in which every edge of the graph appears exactly once. A disconnected graph cannot have an Euler circuit, but if the vertex-degrees are all even then it will have an Euler system, i.e., a collection of Euler circuits, one in each connected component.

This paper is about the circuit theory of 4-regular graphs. The following notion was introduced by Kotzig [18] under the name ξ-*decomposition*, and later studied by Las Vergnas and Martin [19, 20, 21, 24], who used the term *Eulerian partition*. The idea has found applications and generalizations in Kauffman's bracket description of the Jones polynomial [16], and in the interlace polynomials of Arratia, Bollobás and Sorkin [1, 2].

Definition 1 *A* circuit partition *of a 4-regular graph F is a partition of $E(F)$ into pairwise edge-disjoint circuits.*

The following associated definition is implicit in work of Jaeger [14], and was mentioned explicitly by Bouchet in his work on isotropic systems [7, 8].

Definition 2 *If P is a circuit partition in a 4-regular graph F then the* touch-graph *$Tch(P)$ has a vertex v_γ for each circuit $\gamma \in P$, and an edge e_v for each vertex $v \in V(F)$; e_v is incident on v_γ if and only if γ passes through v.*

Two examples are pictured in Figure 1. To trace the circuits included in a circuit partition, maintain the bold/dashed/plain line status when traversing a vertex. (It is sometimes necessary to change the line status in the middle of an edge, to avoid ambiguities at the vertices.)

It is easy to see that F has $3^{|V(F)|}$ circuit partitions, because if C is an Euler system of F then a circuit partition is determined by choosing one of three options at each vertex $v \in V(F)$: follow the circuit of C incident on v when passing through v; follow a different route that is consistent with an orientation of the incident circuit of C when passing through v; or follow a route that is not consistent with an orientation of the incident circuit of



Figure 1: Two circuit partitions, with their touch-graphs.

C when passing through v. These three options are called the *transitions* of F at v; we label them $\phi_C(v)$, $\chi_C(v)$ and $\psi_C(v)$ respectively. Transition labels remain the same if the orientation of a circuit of C is reversed; but if C' differs from C by more than mere orientation reversals, then some transitions will have different labels with respect to C and C'.

We recall the definition of interlacement with respect to Euler systems in 4-regular graphs [6, 12, 28].

Definition 3 *If C is an Euler system of F then two vertices $v \neq w \in V(F)$ are* interlaced *with respect to C if and only if there is a circuit of C on which v and w appear in the order $vwvw$ or $wvwv$. The* interlacement matrix $\mathcal{I}(C)$ *is the $V(F) \times V(F)$ matrix with entries in $GF(2)$ given by: the vw entry is 1 if v and w are interlaced, and 0 otherwise.*

There is a close relationship between circuit partitions and interlacement, different versions of which have been discovered and rediscovered many times. Here is a statement that incorporates the versions that appear most often in the literature.

Theorem 4 *Suppose C is an Euler system of a 4-regular graph F, and P is a circuit partition of F. Let $\mathcal{I}(C, P)$ be the (skew-)symmetric $GF(2)$-matrix obtained from $\mathcal{I}(C)$ by making these two kinds of changes.*

1. *If P involves the $\phi_C(v)$ transition, remove the row and column corresponding to v.*

2. *If P involves the $\psi_C(v)$ transition, change the vv entry to 1.*

Then the $GF(2)$-nullity of $\mathcal{I}(C, P)$ is $|P| - c(F)$, where $|P|$ is the number of circuits in P and $c(F)$ is the number of connected components in F.

We refer to the formula $|P| - c(F) = nullity(\mathcal{I}(C,P))$ as the *circuit-nullity formula*. It seems that the earliest discussion of some version of the formula appears in Brahana's 1921 study of curves on surfaces [10]. However the formula was not widely known until fifty years later, when a special case was discovered by Cohn and Lempel [12]. Both of these references state versions of the circuit-nullity formula which do not mention 4-regular graphs; Brahana refers to the connectivity of a surface and Cohn and Lempel refer to the number of orbits in a certain kind of permutation. Also, the version of Cohn and Lempel is restricted to oriented Euler circuits and circuit partitions; the ψ transitions are not relevant to the permutations they considered. Many other authors have rediscovered, refined or restated the circuit-nullity formula in various ways [3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36].

Two questions about the circuit-nullity formula should come to mind.

Question 1. Is there a version of the circuit-nullity formula that involves nullity over the reals instead of $GF(2)$?

Answer 1. Yes, but the real version that has appeared in the literature is of limited generality. Brahana [10] discussed a skew-symmetric version of his matrix for systems of curves drawn on two-sided surfaces, suggesting a connection with topological orientability. Skew-symmetric versions of $\mathcal{I}(C,P)$ have also been discussed by Bouchet [9], Jonsson [15], Lauri [22] and Macris and Pulé [23]. They all require that C and P be orientation-consistent, i.e., P cannot involve any ψ_C transition.

Question 2. Does the equality $nullity(\mathcal{I}(C,P)) = |P| - c(F)$ indicate a connection between P and the null space of $\mathcal{I}(C,P)$?

Answer 2. Yes, but for full generality the connection involves a non-symmetric matrix in place of $\mathcal{I}(C,P)$. Building on earlier partial results [9, 14, 33], we introduced a modified form of $\mathcal{I}(C,P)$ in [34], and showed that it is very closely connected to the touch-graph $Tch(P)$. This modified form is defined as follows.

Definition 5 *([34]) Let C be an Euler system of a 4-regular graph F, and P a circuit partition of F. Then the* modified interlacement matrix $M(C,P)$ *is the $V(F) \times V(F)$ matrix with entries in $GF(2)$ obtained from $\mathcal{I}(C)$ by making these two kinds of changes:*

1. *If P involves the $\phi_C(v)$ transition, change the vv entry to* 1*, and change every other entry of the v column to* 0*.*

2. *If P involves the $\psi_C(v)$ transition, change the vv entry to* 1*.*

Observe that

$$M(C,P) = \begin{bmatrix} I & * \\ 0 & \mathcal{I}(C,P) \end{bmatrix},$$

where I is an identity matrix whose rows and columns correspond to the vertices of F where P involves the ϕ_C transition. It follows that $M(C,P)$ has the same nullity as $\mathcal{I}(C,P)$. The main theorem of [34] states that if we consider the rows of $M(C,P)$ as elements of the vector space $GF(2)^{E(Tch(P))}$ instead of $GF(2)^{V(F)}$, then the orthogonal complement of the row space of $M(C,P)$ is the subspace spanned by the vertex cocycles of $Tch(P)$. (Recall that the cocycle of a vertex in a graph is the set of non-loop edges incident on that vertex.) To put it more simply: the row space of $M(C,P)$ is the cycle space of $Tch(P)$ over $GF(2)$.

Notice that the answers to Questions 1 and 2 are both of the form "Yes, but..." The second "but" is resolved over $GF(2)$ by using the nonsymmetric matrix $M(C,P)$ in place of the traditional (skew-)symmetric $\mathcal{I}(C,P)$. The purpose of the present paper is to observe that the first "but" is also resolved by using nonsymmetric matrices. In addition to determining the cycle space rather than only the dimension of the cycle space, our result is more general than previously known versions of the circuit-nullity formula over $\mathbb{R}$; there is no orientability requirement.

Theorem 6 *Suppose C is an Euler system of a 4-regular graph F, and P is a circuit partition of F. Then there is a $V(F) \times V(F)$ matrix $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ with integer entries, with these two properties.*

1. *$M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ reduces to $M(C,P)$ (modulo 2).*
2. *The row space of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is the cycle space of $Tch(P)$ over $\mathbb{R}$.*

If $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ satisfies Theorem 6, then $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ also satisfies the circuit-nullity formula over $\mathbb{R}$; that is, the $\mathbb{R}$-nullity of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is $|P| - c(F)$. The reason is simple: $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is a $V(F) \times V(F)$ matrix whose rank is the dimension of the cycle space of $Tch(P)$,

$$|E(Tch(P))| - |V(Tch(P))| + c(Tch(P)) = |V(F)| - |P| + c(Tch(P)).$$

Consequently the $\mathbb{R}$-nullity of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is $|P| - c(Tch(P))$. It is easy to prove that $c(Tch(P)) = c(F)$; see Proposition 10 below.

Unless $Tch(P)$ is a forest, there are infinitely many different matrices $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ which satisfy Theorem 6. For if $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ satisfies Theorem 6 and ρ is a nonzero row of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$, then we may add $\pm 2\rho$ to any row

of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ without disturbing either property specified in Theorem 6. Because of this nonuniqueness we will often refer to "an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ matrix" rather than simply using the notation $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$.

Theorem 6 is proved in Section 2. In Section 3, we provide a standard form for $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$, denoted $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$. The standard form is defined using a signed version of C; that is, for each $v \in V(F)$, one passage of a circuit of C through v is arbitrarily designated v^+, and the other is v^-. When C and P respect the same edge directions in F, $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is closely related to the skew-symmetric matrices used by Bouchet [9], Jonsson [15], Lauri [22] and Macris and Pulé [23]. Moreover, in this special case $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ has several attractive "naturality" properties; for instance if C and C' are two Euler systems which respect the same edge directions then for each signed version of C there is a signed version of C' such that $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C) = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')^{-1}$. The standard form does not have such nice properties in general. For instance, if C and C' are two Euler systems which do not respect the same edge directions then $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')^{-1}$ may have fractional entries. An example of this type is presented in Section 4, along with a couple of other examples; one of them shows that in general we cannot require that $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ be skew-symmetric. In Section 5 we discuss the relationship between $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ and $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P)$ matrices, where C and C' are Euler systems of F; we also summarize the special features of the theory over $GF(2)$. In Sections 6 and 7 we discuss the special features of the orientation-consistent theory over $\mathbb{R}$, including the naturality properties mentioned earlier in this paragraph. The paper ends with a brief account of the important result of Lauri [22] and Macris and Pulé [23], which gives a determinant formula for the number of Euler systems of F that respect the same edge directions as C.

2 Proof of Theorem 6

We begin with an elementary algebraic result. Let $f : \mathbb{Z} \to GF(2)$ be the ring homomorphism with $f(1) = 1$. If G is a graph we obtain a homomorphism $f : \mathbb{Z}^{E(G)} \to GF(2)^{E(G)}$ of abelian groups by applying f in each coordinate.

Lemma 7 *If $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{E(G)}$ then the rank of S in $\mathbb{R}^{E(G)}$ is not less than the rank of $f(S)$ in $GF(2)^{E(G)}$.*

Proof. As the rank is the cardinality of a maximal linearly independent subset, it is enough to show that if $T \subseteq S$ and $f(T)$ is linearly independent, then T is linearly independent too. Suppose instead that T is linearly

dependent. Then there is a sum

$$\sum_{t \in T} q_t t = 0,$$

in which the coefficients q_t are real numbers, not all of which are 0. Eliminating irrational factors, we may presume the q_t are all rational; then multiplying by their denominators and dividing by the greatest common divisor, we may presume that the q_t are integers whose g.c.d. is 1. But then

$$\sum_{t \in T} f(q_t) f(t) = 0,$$

and the $f(q_t)$ are not all 0. This contradicts the independence of $f(T)$. ■

We need to establish some notation and terminology regarding cycles and cocycles in graphs. We follow Bollobás [5, Section II. 3] for the most part, and we refer the reader there for proofs.

Suppose D is a directed version of a graph G and W is a walk in G. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field, and $\mathbb{K}^{E(G)}$ the vector space over $\mathbb{K}$ with basis $E(G)$. There is a vector $z_D(W) \in \mathbb{K}^{E(G)}$ determined by walking along W from beginning to end, and for each edge $e \in E(G)$, tallying $+1$ in the e coordinate each time we pass through e in the D direction, and -1 in the e coordinate each time we pass through e in the opposite direction. The *cycle space* $Z_D(G)$ over $\mathbb{K}$ is the subspace of $\mathbb{K}^{E(G)}$ spanned by $\{z_D(W) \mid W \text{ is a closed walk in } G\}$. Also, if $X \subseteq V(G)$ then there is an element $u_D(X) \in \mathbb{K}^{E(G)}$ whose e coordinate, for each $e \in E(G)$, is $+1$ if e is directed in D from a vertex in X to a vertex not in X, -1 if e is directed in D from a vertex not in X to a vertex in X, and 0 otherwise. The subspace of $\mathbb{K}^{E(G)}$ spanned by $\{u_D(X) \mid X \subseteq V(G)\}$ is the *cocycle space* of G over $\mathbb{K}$, denoted $U_D(G)$.

We recall seven properties of these spaces. (i) No special property is required of $\mathbb{K}$; any field will do. (However we are primarily interested in $\mathbb{K} = GF(2)$ or $\mathbb{R}$.) (ii) No special property is required of D; any directed version of G yields spaces that correspond to all closed walks and all cocycles. (iii) $Z_D(G)$ is spanned by the vectors $z_D(W)$ such that W is a minimal circuit. (iv) $U_D(G)$ is spanned by the vectors $u_D(\{v\})$ such that $v \in V(G)$. (v) If G has $c(G)$ connected components then the dimension of $U_D(G)$ is $|V(G)| - c(G)$. (vi) $U_D(G)$ and $Z_D(G)$ are orthogonal complements. (We refer to this property as *cycle-cocycle duality.*) (vii) The orthogonality between $U_D(G)$ and $Z_D(G)$ rests on the simple observation that as we follow a closed walk, we must enter each subset $X \subseteq V(G)$ the same number of times that we leave X. This simple observation goes back to the very beginning of graph theory, in Euler's discussion of the seven bridges of Königsberg.



Figure 2: F is on the left, and $Tch(P)$ is on the right.

The machinery of cycle-cocycle duality may be summarized in matrix form, like this:

Theorem 8 *Given a spanning set S for $Z_D(G)$, let Z_S be the $S \times E(G)$ matrix whose rows are the elements of S. Let $U_{V(G)}$ be the $E(G) \times V(G)$ matrix whose columns are the vectors $u_D(\{v\})$, $v \in V(G)$. Then $Z_S \cdot U_{V(G)} = 0$, the rank of $U_{V(G)}$ is $|V(G)|-c(G)$, and the rank of Z_S is $|E(G)|-|V(G)|+c(G)$.*

We may now restate Theorem 6 in the following equivalent form.

Theorem 9 *Suppose C is an Euler system of a 4-regular graph F, and P is a circuit partition of F. Let D be a directed version of $G = Tch(P)$. Then there is a matrix $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ of integers, which has the following properties.*

1. *$M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ reduces (modulo 2) to $M(C, P)$.*
2. *In the notation of Theorem 8 with $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$, $Z_D(G)$ has a spanning set S such that $Z_S = M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$.*

Suppose now that P is a circuit partition in a 4-regular graph F. As discussed in the introduction, P is determined by the choice of a transition $P(v)$ at each vertex of F. In the introduction, these transitions were labeled according to their relationship with an Euler system C. It is more natural to describe the transitions in a different way, which does not require using an Euler system for reference. If $v \in V(F)$ then there are four half-edges incident on v, and any time we follow a trail through v we must enter along one half-edge, and leave along a different half-edge. We call such a pairing of two different half-edges a *single transition* at v. A transition at v is simply a set of two disjoint single transitions at v.

Recall that edges of $Tch(P)$ correspond to vertices of F and vertices of $Tch(P)$ correspond to circuits of F, as indicated in Figure 2. There is also

a relationship between closed walks in F and closed walks in $Tch(P)$, which we proceed to describe.

As suggested in Figure 2, there is a natural 2-to-1 surjection

$$\pi_P : \{\text{half-edges of } F\} \to \{\text{half-edges of } Tch(P)\},$$

which we denote $\pi_P(h) = \overline{h}$. Suppose the four half-edges of F incident on v are h_v^1, h_v^2, h_v^3 and h_v^4, and the two single transitions included in $P(v)$ are $\{h_v^1, h_v^2\}$ and $\{h_v^3, h_v^4\}$. Let $\gamma \in P$ be the circuit that includes h_v^1 and h_v^2, and let $\gamma' \in P$ is the circuit that includes h_v^3 and h_v^4. Then the two half-edges of e_v in $Tch(P)$ are $\overline{h_v^1} = \overline{h_v^2}$ and $\overline{h_v^3} = \overline{h_v^4}$. The half-edge $\overline{h_v^1} = \overline{h_v^2}$ is incident on the vertex $v_\gamma \in V(Tch(P))$, and the half-edge $\overline{h_v^3} = \overline{h_v^4}$ is incident on the vertex $v_{\gamma'} \in V(Tch(P))$.

This surjection π_P on half-edges induces a related surjection,

$$\pi_P : \{\text{closed walks in } F\} \to \{\text{closed walks in } Tch(P)\}.$$

Suppose W is the closed walk v_1, h_1, h_1', v_2, ..., v_k, h_k, h_k', $v_{k+1} = v_1$ in F. Then there are circuits $\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k \in P$ such that γ_i includes the edge $e_i \in E(F)$ whose half-edges are h_i and h_i'. Consider the list v_{γ_1}, $\overline{h_1'}$, $\overline{h_2}$, v_{γ_2}, ..., v_{γ_k}, $\overline{h_k'}$, $\overline{h_1}$, v_{γ_1} of vertices and half-edges in $Tch(P)$. Each index $i \in \{1, ..., k\}$ is of one of the following three types. A type (a) index has $\gamma_i \neq \gamma_{i+1}$. In this case $\overline{h_i'} \neq \overline{h_{i+1}}$ and $e_{v_{i+1}} = \{\overline{h_i'}, \overline{h_{i+1}}\}$ is a nonloop edge of $Tch(P)$. A type (b) index has $\gamma_i = \gamma_{i+1}$, and the single transition $\{h_i', h_{i+1}\}$ is excluded from P. In this case $\overline{h_i'} \neq \overline{h_{i+1}}$ and $e_{v_{i+1}} = \{\overline{h_i'}, \overline{h_{i+1}}\}$ is a loop of $Tch(P)$. A type (c) index has $\gamma_i = \gamma_{i+1}$, and the single transition $\{h_i', h_{i+1}\}$ is included in P. In this case $\overline{h_i'} = \overline{h_{i+1}}$ and the pair $\{\overline{h_i'}, \overline{h_{i+1}}\}$ is not an edge of $Tch(P)$. We define $\pi_P(W) = \overline{W}$ to be the closed walk in $Tch(P)$ obtained from the list v_{γ_1}, $\overline{h_1'}$, $\overline{h_2}$, v_{γ_2}, ..., v_{γ_k}, $\overline{h_k'}$, $\overline{h_1}$, v_{γ_1} by removing every subsequence γ_i, $\overline{h_i}$, $\overline{h_{i+1}'}$ with i of type (c).

Proposition 10 *There is a one-to-one correspondence between connected components of F and $Tch(P)$: $\{v_1, ..., v_k\}$ is the vertex set of a connected component of F if and only if $\{e_{v_1}, ..., e_{v_k}\}$ is the edge set of a connected component of $Tch(P)$.*

Proof. As F is 4-regular, every connected component of F has an Euler circuit. Two vertices of F belong to the same connected component if and only if they appear on the same one of these Euler circuits. The images of these Euler circuits under π_P are closed walks in $Tch(P)$, and two vertices of $Tch(P)$ belong to the same connected component if and only if they appear on the same one of these closed walks. ■

Definition 11 *Suppose C is an Euler system for a 4-regular graph F, and $v \in V(F)$. Then the* fundamental circuits *of C at v are the two closed trails obtained by following a circuit of C from v to v. We denote them $C_1(C, v)$ and $C_2(C, v)$, with the indices arbitrary.*

That is, $\{C_1(C, v), C_2(c, v)\}$ is the circuit partition defined by $\chi_C(v)$ and the transitions $\phi_C(w)$, $w \neq v$. The crucial property of the fundamental circuits is this:

Theorem 12 *Let C be an Euler system for a 4-regular graph F, and let Γ be a set of fundamental circuits, which includes one of $C_1(C, v), C_2(C, v)$ for each $v \in V(F)$. Then for every circuit partition P of F and every choice of a digraph D on $Tch(P)$, the set $S = \{z_D(\overline{\gamma}) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ spans the subspace $Z_D(Tch(P))$ of $\mathbb{R}^{E(Tch(P))}$.*

Proof. Every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is a closed walk in F, so $\overline{\gamma}$ is a closed walk in $Tch(P)$. Consequently $S \subseteq Z_D(Tch(P))$. To prove that S spans $Z_D(Tch(P))$, it is enough to prove that the rank of S is at least

$$\dim Z_D(Tch(P)) = |E(Tch(P))| - |V(Tch(P))| + c(Tch(P)).$$

Let $f : \mathbb{Z} \to GF(2)$ be the map of Lemma 7. Notice that $M(C, P)$ is a $GF(2)$-matrix whose rows are the elements $f(s)$ with $s \in S$, so the circuit-nullity formula over $GF(2)$ tells us that the nullity of $f(S)$ is $|P| - c(F) = |V(Tch(P))| - c(Tch(P))$. As $|S| = |V(F)| = |E(Tch(P)|$, the rank of $f(S)$ is $|f(S)| - nullity(f(S)) = |E(Tch(P))| - |V(Tch(P))| + c(Tch(P))$. The proof is completed by Lemma 7, which tells us that the rank of S is not less than the rank of $f(S)$. ■

Theorem 12 tells us that if Γ contains one fundamental circuit for each vertex of F, then Theorems 6 and 9 are satisfied by the $V(F) \times V(F)$ matrix whose rows are the vectors $z_D(\overline{\gamma})$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

3 A standard form for $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$

In this section we describe an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ matrix obtained by using particular choices in the construction of Section 2. With these choices, all entries of the matrix lie in $\{-1, 0, 1, 2\}$. Moreover in the special case involving orientation-consistent circuits, the matrix contains the $\mathcal{I}(C, P)$ matrix used by Bouchet [9], Jonsson [15], Lauri [22] and Macris and Pulé [23]. More details about this special case are given in Section 7.

Recall that the circuits of C have preferred orientations but do not have preferred starting points. For each $v \in V(F)$, let the half-edges of F incident on v be denoted h_v^1, h_v^2, h_v^3 and h_v^4 in such a way that the circuit of C incident on v is $...h_v^1, v, h_v^2, ..., h_v^3, v, h_v^4, ...$ As C does not have a preferred starting point, the distinction between the two passages of C through v is arbitrary; we use $+$ and $-$ to distinguish them notationally: one passage is h_v^1, v^+, h_v^2 and the other is h_v^3, v^-, h_v^4. Let D be the directed version of $Tch(P)$ in which the initial half-edge of the edge e_v is $\overline{h_v^1}$. Index the fundamental circuits $C_i(C, v)$ so that $C_1(C, v)$ includes h_1^v. Let $M_{\mathbb{R}}^0(C, P)$ be the $V(F) \times V(F)$ matrix whose v row is $z_D(\overline{C_1(C, v)})$, for each vertex v.

A compact way to encode this information is to write C as a set of double occurrence words, one for each connected component of F, and for each vertex v, to designate which appearance is v^+ and which is v^-. Then for each $v \in V(F)$, the v row of $M_{\mathbb{R}}^0(C, P)$ is obtained by tallying the contributions of passages through the vertices encountered as we follow a circuit of C from v^- to v^+. We proceed to calculate the resulting entries $M_{\mathbb{R}}^0(C, P)_{vw}$.

Suppose $v \in V(F)$. The circuit $C_1(C, v)$ includes the passage $...h_v^1, h_v^4, ...$ and no other passage through v. If $\phi_C(v) = P(v)$ then the initial half-edge of e_v is $\overline{h_v^1} = \overline{h_v^2}$, and the terminal half-edge is $\overline{h_v^3} = \overline{h_v^4}$, so $\overline{C_1(C, v)}$ traverses e_v in the positive direction. If $\chi_C(v) = P(v)$ then the initial half-edge of e_v is $\overline{h_v^1} = \overline{h_v^4}$, and the terminal half-edge is $\overline{h_v^2} = \overline{h_v^3}$, so $\overline{C_1(C, v)}$ does not traverse e_v. If $\psi_C(v) = P(v)$ then the initial half-edge of e_v is $\overline{h_v^1} = \overline{h_v^3}$, and the terminal half-edge is $\overline{h_v^2} = \overline{h_v^4}$, so $\overline{C_1(C, v)}$ traverses e_v in the positive direction. We have the following.

$$M_{\mathbb{R}}^0(C, P)_{vv} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } P(v) \in \{\phi_C(v), \psi_C(v)\} \\ 0, & \text{if } P(v) = \chi_C(v) \end{cases}$$

Now, suppose $v \neq w \in V(F)$. If $\phi_C(w) = P(w)$ then any passage of $C_1(C, v)$ through w contributes 0 to $M_{\mathbb{R}}^0(C, P)_{vw}$. If $\chi_C(w) = P(w)$ then the initial half-edge of e_w is $\overline{h_w^1} = \overline{h_w^4}$, and the terminal half-edge is $\overline{h_w^2} = \overline{h_w^3}$. Consequently if $\overline{C_1(C, v)}$ includes the passage $...\overline{h_w^1}, \overline{h_w^2}, ...$ then this passage contributes 1 to $M_{\mathbb{R}}^0(C, P)_{vw}$; and if $\overline{C_1(C, v)}$ includes the passage $...\overline{h_w^3}, \overline{h_w^4}, ...$ then this passage contributes -1 to $M_{\mathbb{R}}^0(C, P)_{vw}$. If $\psi_C(w) = P(w)$ then the initial half-edge of e_w is $\overline{h_w^1} = \overline{h_w^3}$, and the terminal half-edge is $\overline{h_w^2} = \overline{h_w^4}$. Consequently if $\overline{C_1(C, v)}$ includes the passage $...\overline{h_w^1}, \overline{h_w^2}, ...$ then this passage contributes 1 to $M_{\mathbb{R}}^0(C, P)_{vw}$; and if $\overline{C_1(C, v)}$ includes the passage $...\overline{h_w^3}, \overline{h_w^4}, ...$ then this passage also contributes 1 to

$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)_{vw}$. In sum, for $v \neq w \in V(F)$ we have the following.

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)_{vw} =$$

$$\begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } v \text{ and } w \text{ lie in different connected components of } F \\ 0, & \text{if } \phi_C(w) = P(w) \\ 0, & \text{if } \chi_C(w) = P(w) \text{ and } v \text{ and } w \text{ are not interlaced with respect to } C \\ 1, & \text{if } \chi_C(w) = P(w) \text{ and a circuit of } C \text{ is } v^-...w^+...v^+...w^-... \\ -1, & \text{if } \chi_C(w) = P(w) \text{ and a circuit of } C \text{ is } v^-...w^-...v^+...w^+... \\ 1, & \text{if } \psi_C(w) = P(w) \text{ and } v \text{ and } w \text{ are interlaced with respect to } C \\ 0, & \text{if } \psi_C(w) = P(w) \text{ and a circuit of } C \text{ is } v^-...v^+...w...w... \\ 2, & \text{if } \psi_C(w) = P(w) \text{ and a circuit of } C \text{ is } v^-...w...w...v^+... \end{cases}$$

The reader will have no trouble verifying the following properties of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$. Suppose we let $V(F) = V_\phi \cup V_\chi \cup V_\psi$, in such a way that $v \in V_\alpha$ if and only if $\alpha_C(v) = P(v)$. Then $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ V_\phi \\ V_\chi \\ V_\psi \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} V_\phi & V_\chi & V_\psi \end{array} \\ \begin{pmatrix} I & M_1 & M_2 \\ 0 & M_3 & M_4 \\ 0 & M_5 & M_6 \end{pmatrix} \end{array},$$

where the indicated submatrices have the following properties. I is an identity matrix, the entries of M_1 all lie in $\{-1,0,1\}$, and the entries of M_2 all lie in $\{0,1,2\}$. M_3 is a skew-symmetric matrix with entries in $\{-1,0,1\}$. (In the special case $V_\psi = \varnothing$, M_3 is the matrix $\mathcal{I}(C,P)$ used by Bouchet [9] (when V_ϕ is empty), Jonsson [15], Lauri [22] and Macris and Pulé [23].) M_4 has entries from $\{0,1,2\}$ and M_5 has entries from $\{-1,0,1\}$. There is a limited symmetry connecting M_4 and M_5: if the vw entry of M_4 is 0 or 2 then the wv entry of M_5 is 0; and if the vw entry of M_4 is 1 then the wv entry of M_5 is 1 or -1. M_6 has diagonal entries equal to 1 and all other entries from $\{0,1,2\}$; it reduces (mod 2) to a symmetric matrix. Interchanging the appearances of v^- and v^+ on C produces three changes in $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$: if $P(v) = \chi_C(v)$ then the v column of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is multiplied by -1; if $P(w) = \chi_C(w)$ then $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)_{vw}$ is multiplied by -1; and if $P(w) = \psi_C(w)$ then $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)_{vw}$ is changed by the replacement $0 \leftrightarrow 2$. Notice that all three changes have no effect modulo 2, reflecting the fact that $M(C,P)$ is a uniquely defined matrix over $GF(2)$. Notice also that if P does not involve any ψ_C transition then the third kind of change does not occur, so the effect of interchanging v^- and v^+ on C can be described using elementary row and column operations; this special case is detailed in Section 7.

4 Four examples

Our first example illustrates the fact that if C and P do not respect the same edge directions, it may be that there is no skew-symmetric matrix that reduces to $\mathcal{I}(C,P)$ (mod 2) and has nullity $|P| - c(F)$.

Let F be the 4-regular graph with $V(F) = \{a, b, c\}$ that is obtained from K_3 by doubling edges. Then F has an Euler circuit described by the double occurrence word *abcabc*. We will use the standard form $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ corresponding to $a^+b^-c^+a^-b^+c^-$, and the natural notation for edges of F, e.g., the two edges connecting a to b are $a^+b^- = b^-a^+$ and $a^-b^+ = b^+a^-$. Let P be the circuit partition that includes $\gamma_1 = \{a^+b^-, a^-b^+\}$, $\gamma_2 = \{a^+c^-, a^-c^+\}$ and $\gamma_3 = \{b^+c^-, b^-c^+\}$. Then $Tch(P) \cong K_3$. Let D be the oriented version of $Tch(P)$ used in Section 3: e_a is directed from v_{γ_2} to v_{γ_1}, e_b is directed from v_{γ_1} to v_{γ_3} and e_c is directed from v_{γ_3} to v_{γ_2}. Then $Z_D(Tch(P))$ is spanned by the vector $(1,1,1)$.

P involves the ψ_C transition at every vertex, so

$$\mathcal{I}(C,P) = M(C,P) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The $GF(2)$-nullity of $M(C,P)$ is 2, as predicted by the circuit-nullity formula, and the rows of $M(C,P)$ span the cycle space $Z_D(Tch(P))$ over $GF(2)$.

It is a simple matter to check that every skew-symmetric version of $M(C,P)$ is of nullity 0 or 1 over $\mathbb{R}$, so the circuit-nullity formula over $\mathbb{R}$ is not satisfied by any skew-symmetric version of $M(C,P)$. However the definition of Section 3 yields

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The nullity of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is 2, and the row space of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is $Z_D(Tch(P))$.

Our second example illustrates Theorem 6 for the standard form of Section 3. Let F be the simple 4-regular graph with $V(F) = \{a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h\}$ and Euler circuit C given by the signed double occurrence word

$$e^-a^-b^-f^-e^+h^-g^-f^+a^+d^-h^+c^-b^+g^+c^+d^+.$$

Consider the circuit partition P that involves the $\phi_C(a)$, $\chi_C(e)$ and $\chi_C(g)$ transitions, along with the ψ_C transition at every other vertex. Then P



Figure 3: The directed touch-graph from the second example.

includes four circuits: $\gamma_1 = \{ab,\ bc,\ cd,\ da,\ af,\ fe,\ ea\}$, $\gamma_2 = \{bf,\ fg,\ gb\}$, $\gamma_3 = \{ch,\ hg,\ gc\}$ and $\gamma_4 = \{de,\ eh,\ hd\}$. The construction of Section 3 yields the directed version of $Tch(P)$ illustrated in Figure 3, and the matrix

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & -1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is not hard to see that the rows of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ span the cycle space of $Tch(P)$ over $\mathbb{R}$. Some rows represent individual circuits, like e_b+e_f (the fifth row) or $e_e+e_f-e_g+e_h$ (the sixth row); other rows represent combinations of circuits, like $e_a+(e_b+e_f)+(e_e+e_f-e_g+e_h)$ (the first row). Also, $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ reduces to $M(C,P)$ (mod 2), and the product $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)\cdot U_{V(Tch(P))}$ is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & -1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Notice that if we add -2 times the third row of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ to the fourth row, and add -2 times the sixth row to each of the first two rows, then the

resulting matrix has the same reduction (mod 2) and the same row space as $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$, and its entries are all in $\{-1,0,1\}$. We do not know whether it is always possible to eliminate entries outside $\{-1,0,1\}$ in this way.

Our third example involves two Euler circuits of K_5: C is given by the double occurrence word *abdcaecbed* and C' is given by the double occurrence word *abcdecadbe*. On the left below is the $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')$ matrix for the signed version $a^-b^-d^-c^-a^+e^-c^+b^+e^+d^+$ of C; its inverse appears on the right. (We abuse notation slightly by writing $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')$ rather than $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,\{C'\})$.)

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The inverse matrix is an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C)$ matrix, though it is not in standard form. The $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')$ matrix for the signed version $a^-b^+d^+c^-a^+e^-c^+b^-e^+d^-$ of C is on the left below; its inverse appears on the right.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \left(\frac{1}{3}\right) \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & 2 & 3 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -2 & 0 & 1 \\ -2 & -2 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

In this case $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')^{-1}$ is not a matrix of integers, so it is certainly not an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C)$ matrix; but $3 \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')^{-1}$ is an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C)$ matrix. Also, $\det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C') = 3$ tells us that the rows of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')$ generate a proper subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}^{E(Tch(C'))}$. Every edge of $Tch(C')$ is a loop, though, so the cycle space of $Tch(C')$ includes all of $\mathbb{Z}^{E(Tch(C'))}$.

Our fourth example includes C' and another Euler circuit C'' of K_5, given by the double occurrence word *abecdbcade*. Using the signed form $a^-b^+c^-d^+e^-c^+a^+d^-b^-e^+$ of C', we obtain

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C'') = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using the signed form $a^+b^-e^-c^-d^-b^+c^+a^-d^+e^+$ of C'', we obtain

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C'', C') = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C'')^{-1}.$$

5 The effect of a κ-transformation

The fundamental operation of the theory of Euler systems of 4-regular graphs was introduced by Kotzig [18].

Definition 13 *If C is an Euler system of a 4-regular graph F and $v \in V(F)$ then a* κ-transform *$C * v$ is an Euler system obtained from C by reversing one of the fundamental circuits $C_i(C, v)$ within a circuit of C.*

Definition 13 provides two choices for $C*v$, which differ by the orientation of a circuit of $C * v$. For instance, if C is the Euler circuit of K_5 given by the double occurrence word *abdcaecbed* then $C * a$ is given by *acdbaecbed* or *abdcadebce*. A consequence of this ambiguity is that $C * v * v$ may be C itself, or the Euler system obtained from C by reversing the circuit at v. Kotzig [18] proved that if C and C' are any two Euler systems of F then there is a sequence $v_1, ..., v_k$ of vertices of F such that $C' = C * v_1 * \cdots * v_k$. We refer to this fundamental result as *Kotzig's theorem.*

It is not hard to see that the effect of a κ-transformation on transition labels is given by the following.

Proposition 14 *Transition labels with respect to C and $C * v$ differ only in these two ways.*

- *$\phi_C(v) = \psi_{C*v}(v)$ and $\psi_C(v) = \phi_{C*v}(v)$.*
- *If w is interlaced with v then $\chi_C(w) = \psi_{C*v}(w)$ and $\psi_C(w) = \chi_{C*v}(w)$.*

Recall that if we are given C and P, $M(C, P)$ is the matrix over $GF(2)$ specified in Definition 5. Proposition 14 implies the following three properties, which we describe collectively as "naturality" of $M(C, P)$ with respect to κ-transformations. See [34] for a detailed discussion. (Special cases of the third property appear also in earlier work of Bouchet [9] and Jaeger [14].)

Corollary 15 *([34]) If P is a circuit partition of F and C, C' are Euler systems of F then the following properties hold.*

1. *If $v \in V(F)$ then $M(C * v, P)$ is obtained from $M(C, P)$ by adding the v row to the w row whenever $w \neq v$ and w is interlaced with v on C.*
2. *$M(C', P) = M(C', C) \cdot M(C, P)$.*
3. *$M(C, C') = M(C', C)^{-1}$.*

Proof. The first assertion follows from Proposition 14.

For the second property recall that by Kotzig's theorem, there is a sequence $v_1, ..., v_k$ of vertices of F such that $C' = C * v_1 * \cdots * v_k$. The first property tells us that this sequence of κ-transformations induces a corresponding sequence of elementary row operations, which transforms the double matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} I = M(C, C) & M(C, P) \end{bmatrix}$$

into the double matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} M(C', C) & M(C', P) \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows that if E is the product of elementary matrices corresponding to the induced elementary row operations, then $E \cdot I = M(C', C)$ and $E \cdot M(C, P) = M(C', P)$.

For the third property, notice that the second property tells us that $I = M(C', C') = M(C', C) \cdot M(C, C')$. ■

Over $\mathbb{R}$, in contrast, we do not have a uniquely defined $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ matrix. Consequently the naturality properties of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ over $\mathbb{R}$ are less precise than the properties of Corollary 15.

Corollary 16 *If C and C' are Euler systems of F then the following properties hold.*

1. *Every $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$ matrix is nonsingular, and has the property that*

$$\big(\det M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')\big) \cdot M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')^{-1}$$

   is an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C)$ matrix.

2. *Let P be a circuit partition of F. Given an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C)$ matrix and an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ matrix, the product*

$$M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C) \cdot M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$$

   is an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', P)$ matrix.

Proof. As $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$ satisfies Theorem 6, it is a nonsingular matrix of integers that reduces to $M(C, C')$ (mod 2); it follows that $\det M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$ reduces to $\det M(C, C')$ (mod 2). The circuit-nullity formula tells us that $M(C, C')$ is a nonsingular $GF(2)$-matrix, so $\det M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$ is an odd integer. It follows that $(\det M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')) \cdot M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')^{-1}$ is a nonsingular matrix of integers that reduces (mod 2) to $M(C, C')^{-1}$. Corollary 15 tells us that $M(C, C')^{-1} = M(C', C)$, so $(\det M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')) \cdot M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')^{-1}$ is an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C)$ matrix.

For the second property, notice that the nonsingularity of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C)$ implies that the row space of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C) \cdot M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ is the same as the row space of $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$. Corollary 15 tells us that $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C) \cdot M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ reduces to $M(C', P)$ (mod 2), so $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C) \cdot M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ is an $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C', P)$ matrix. ■

Multiplying by $\det M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$ is necessary in part 1 because as we saw in Section 4, if $|\det M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')| > 1$ then $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')^{-1}$ may have entries that are not integers. We should mention though that in recent work [11], R. Brijder and the author have shown that it is possible to choose fundamental circuits in a special way so that the resulting $M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$ matrices have $\det M_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C') = \pm 1$.

6 The effect of a transposition

In addition to κ-transformations, Kotzig [18] also defined "ϱ-transformations" on Euler systems. We follow Arratia, Bollobás and Sorkin [1, 2] and use a different name for this operation.

Definition 17 *If C is an Euler system of a 4-regular graph F and $v, w \in V(F)$ are interlaced with respect to C, then the* transposition $C * (vw)$ *is an Euler system obtained from C by interchanging the v-to-w trails within a circuit of C.*

Several properties of transpositions are readily apparent. One property is that $G * (vw)$ is uniquely defined, unlike $G * v$. Also, the transpositions $G*(vw)$ and $G*(wv)$ are the same. Moreover, a transposition can be effected by performing three κ-transformations: if $C = vT_1wT_2vT_3wT_4$ then

$$\begin{aligned}((C * v) * w) * v &= ((v\overleftarrow{T_2}w\overleftarrow{T_1}vT_3wT_4) * w) * v \\ &= (v\overleftarrow{T_2}w\overleftarrow{T_3}vT_1wT_4) * v = vT_3wT_2vT_1wT_4 = C * (vw),\end{aligned}$$

where $\overleftarrow{T_i}$ indicates reversal of the trail T_i. Another property is that C and $C * (vw)$ respect the same edge directions. In fact, Kotzig [18], Pevzner [27]

and Ukkonen [35] proved that if C and C' are two Euler systems of F, then C and C' respect the same edge directions if and only if it is possible to obtain C' from C using transpositions.

It is not hard to see that the effect of a transposition on transition labels is given by the following.

Proposition 18 *If v and w are interlaced with respect to C then transition labels with respect to C and $C*(vw)$ differ only in these ways: $\chi_{C*(vw)}(v) = \phi_C(v)$, $\phi_{C*(vw)}(v) = \chi_C(v)$, $\chi_{C*(vw)}(w) = \phi_C(w)$ and $\phi_{C*(vw)}(w) = \chi_C(w)$.*

Despite the fact that a transposition's effect on transition labels is less complicated than the effect of a κ-transformation, Euler systems related through transpositions may give rise to $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}$ matrices that are related in complicated ways. For example, the following Euler circuits of K_5 yield the matrices below.

$$\begin{aligned} C\text{: } & a^-e^-c^+b^+d^+c^-a^+b^-e^+d^- \\ C*(cd)\text{ : } & a^-e^-c^+a^+b^-e^+d^-c^-b^+d^+ \\ C'\text{ : } & abcdecadbe \end{aligned}$$

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C') = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(cd), C') = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Notice that $\det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C') = -3$ and $\det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(cd), C') = -1$, so although $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$ and $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(cd), C')$ are row equivalent over $\mathbb{R}$, they are not row equivalent over $\mathbb{Z}$.

7 The oriented case

In this section we show that in case C and P respect the same edge directions, the standard form $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P)$ described in Section 3 has naturality properties over $\mathbb{Z}$ that are very similar to the naturality properties of

$M(C,P)$ over $GF(2)$, stated in Corollary 15. Moreover, $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ includes the skew-symmetric signed interlacement matrices of Brahana [10], Bouchet [9], Jonsson [15], Lauri [22] and Macris and Pulé [23].

Suppose that C and P are oriented consistently; then $\psi_C(v) \notin P\ \forall v \in V(F)$. Recall the notational scheme of Section 3: for each $v \in V$, one passage of C through v is $...h^1_v, v^+, h^2_v, ...$ and the other is $...h^3_v, v^-, h^4_v, ...$ Also, D is the directed version of $Tch(P)$ in which each vertex $v \in V(F)$ has $\overrightarrow{h^1_v}$ as the initial half-edge of the edge e_v of $Tch(P)$. Let $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)$ be the $V(F) \times V(F)$ matrix whose diagonal entries all equal 0, and whose vw entry is given by: $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{vw} = 1$ if v and w occur on C in the order $v^+w^-v^-w^+$, $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{vw} = -1$ if v and w occur on C in the order $v^+w^+v^-w^-$, and $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{vw} = 0$ if v and w are not interlaced on C. Then

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) = \begin{bmatrix} I & \mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) \\ 0 & \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) \end{bmatrix},$$

where I is an identity matrix whose rows and columns correspond to vertices $v \in V(F)$ with $\phi_C(v) = P(v)$, $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is the submatrix of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)$ whose rows and columns correspond to vertices $v \in V(F)$ with $\chi_C(v) = P(v)$, and $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is the submatrix of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)$ whose rows (resp. columns) correspond to vertices $v \in V(F)$ with $\phi_C(v) = P(v)$ (resp. $\chi_C(v) = P(v)$).

Two properties of these matrices are apparent.

- Both $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ are skew-symmetric.
- If we interchange v^+ and v^- on C, the effect on both $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)$ and $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ is to multiply the v row and the v column by -1.

Some new notation will be useful. Suppose T is a sub-trail of a circuit of C. Let $\phi_C(T) \in \mathbb{Z}^{V(F)}$ be the vector whose x coordinate, for each $x \in V(F)$ with $P(x) = \phi_C(x)$, is obtained by tallying passages of T through x, with x^+ contributing 1 and x^- contributing -1. If $P(x) = \chi_C(x)$ then the x coordinate of $\phi_C(T)$ is 0. Let $\chi_C(T) \in \mathbb{Z}^{V(F)}$ be the vector obtained in the same way, but tallying contributions only with respect to those x with $P(x) = \chi_C(x)$. Also, for each vertex $x \in V(F)$ let $\rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P))$ denote the x row of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$. The definition of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ may now be rephrased as follows: if a circuit of C is $x^-C_1(C,x)x^+C_2(C,x)$ then

$$\rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)) = \chi_C(C_1(C,x)) + \phi_C(x^+).$$

Kotzig [18], Pevzner [27] and Ukkonen [35] proved that if C and C' are two Euler systems of F, then C and C' respect the same edge directions if and only if it is possible to obtain C' from C using transpositions.

Consequently, in order to describe the relationship between $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ and $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P)$ it suffices to understand the relationship between $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ and $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P)$.

Proposition 19 *Suppose C is an Euler system of F, which includes a circuit $v^+T_1w^+T_2v^-T_3w^-T_4$. Consider the signed version of $C*(vw)$ obtained from C by using $v^+T_3w^-T_2v^-T_1w^+T_4$. Let P be a circuit partition such that $\psi_C(x) \neq P(x)\ \forall x \in V(F)$. Then $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ and $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P)$ are related through elementary row operations, as follows:*

1. $\rho_v(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P)) = \rho_w(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P))$.
2. $\rho_w(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P)) = -\rho_v(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P))$.
3. *If $x \in V(F) - \{v,w\}$ then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P))\\ &= \rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)) + \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{xw}\rho_v(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{xv}\rho_w(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Property 1 follows immediately from Proposition 18 and the rephrased definition of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$ given above:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_v(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P)) &= \chi_{C*(vw)}(T_1w^+T_4) + \phi_{C*(vw)}(v^+)\\ &= \chi_C(T_1) + \chi_C(T_4) + \phi_C(w^+) + \chi_C(v^+)\\ &= \chi_C(T_4v^+T_1) + \phi_C(w^+) = \rho_w(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)).\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Property 2 uses the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^4 \chi_C(T_i) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_w(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P)) &= \chi_{C*(vw)}(T_2v^-T_1) + \phi_{C*(vw)}(w^+)\\ &= \chi_C(T_2) + \chi_C(T_1) + \phi_C(v^-) + \chi_C(w^+)\\ &= -\chi_C(T_3) - \chi_C(T_4) - \phi_C(v^+) - \chi_C(w^-)\\ &= -\chi_C(T_3w^-T_4) - \phi_C(v^+) = -\rho_v(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)).\end{aligned}$$

Property 3 has many cases, with x^- and x^+ in various positions. We detail three cases, and leave the rest to the reader.

If x is not interlaced with either v or w, then $C_1(C,x)$ and $C_1(C*(vw),x)$ may not be the same trail, but they will involve the same passages through vertices, so $\rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)) = \rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P))$.

Suppose x^- appears in T_1 and x^+ appears in T_2; say $T_1 = T_{11}x^-T_{12}$ and $T_2 = T_{21}x^+T_{22}$. Then $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{xv} = 0$, $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{xw} = 1$ and

$$\begin{gathered}\rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P))\\ = \chi_{C*(vw)}(T_{12}w^+T_4v^+T_3w^-T_{21}) + \phi_{C*(vw)}(x^+)\\ = \chi_C(T_{12}) + \chi_C(T_4) + \phi_C(v^+) + \chi_C(T_3) + \chi_C(T_{21}) + \phi_C(x^+)\\ = \chi_C(T_{12}) + \chi_C(w^+T_{21}) - \chi_C(w^+) + \phi_C(x^+) + \chi_C(T_4) + \phi_C(v^+) + \chi_C(T_3)\\ = \chi_C(T_{12}w^+T_{21}) + \phi_C(x^+) + \chi_C(T_3w^-T_4) + \phi_C(v^+)\\ = \rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)) + \rho_v(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)).\end{gathered}$$

Suppose x^- appears in T_4 and x^+ appears in T_2; say $T_2 = T_{21}x^+T_{22}$ and $T_4 = T_{41}x^-T_{42}$. Then $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{xv} = 1 = \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)_{xw}$ and

$$\begin{gathered}\rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P)) = \chi_{C*(vw)}(T_{42}v^+T_3w^-T_{21}) + \phi_{C*(vw)}(x^+)\\ = \chi_C(T_{42}) + \phi_C(v^+) + \chi_C(T_3) + \phi_C(w^-) + \chi_C(T_{21}) + \phi_C(x^+)\\ = \chi_C(T_{42}v^+T_1w^+T_{21}) - \chi_C(v^+T_1w^+) + \phi_C(x^+) - \phi_C(w^+)\\ +\phi_C(v^+) + \chi_C(T_3)\\ = \phi_C(x^+) + \chi_C(T_{42}v^+T_1w^+T_{21}) + \chi_C(w^-) - \chi_C(T_4v^+T_1) + \chi_C(T_4)\\ -\phi_C(w^+) + \phi_C(v^+) + \chi_C(T_3)\\ = \rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)) - \chi_C(T_4v^+T_1) - \phi_C(w^+) + \chi_C(T_3w^-T_4) + \phi_C(v^+)\\ = \rho_x(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)) - \rho_w(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)) + \rho_v(M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)).\end{gathered}$$

■

Proposition 19 uses the same set of elementary row operations to obtain $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C*(vw),P)$ from $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$, for every circuit partition P with $\psi_C(x) \neq P(x)$ $\forall x \in V(F)$. This lack of dependence on P leads to strong naturality properties, just as it does in the proof of Corollary 15. We believe these properties have not appeared in the literature, except for the special case of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C) = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')^{-1}$ involving Euler circuits with $\phi_C(v) \neq \phi_{C'}(v)$ $\forall v \in V(F)$, which is due to Bouchet [9].

Corollary 20 *Suppose C and C' are Euler systems of F, which respect the same edge directions. Then for each signed version of C there is a corresponding signed version of C' such that $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C) = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')^{-1}$. Moreover if P is a circuit partition that respects the same edge directions, then these signed versions of C and C' have $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P) = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C)\cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P)$.*

Proof. According to the theorem of Kotzig [18], Pevzner [27] and Ukkonen [35] mentioned above, there is a sequence of transpositions that trans-

forms a signed version of C into a signed version of C' using the sign convention of Proposition 19. Proposition 19 also gives us an induced sequence of elementary row operations, which transforms the double matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} I = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C) & M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) \end{bmatrix}$$

into the double matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C) & M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P) \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows that if E is the product of elementary matrices corresponding to the induced elementary row operations, then $E \cdot I = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C)$ and $E \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P)$. In particular, if $P = C'$ we deduce that $E \cdot I = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C)$ and $E \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C') = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C') = I$. ■

Corollary 21 *Suppose C and C' are Euler systems of F, which respect the same edge directions. Consider arbitrary signed versions of C and C'. Then there is a matrix Δ with the following properties.*

1. *Every diagonal entry of Δ is ± 1, and every other entry of Δ is 0.*
2. *$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C) = \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')^{-1} \cdot \Delta$.*
3. *If P is any circuit partition that respects the same edge directions as C and C', then $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P) = M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C) \cdot \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) \cdot \Delta$.*

Proof. Let C'' denote the signed version of C' that corresponds to the given signed version of C, as in Corollary 20. For any circuit partition P with $P(x) \neq \psi_C(x)\ \forall x \in V(F)$, $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P)$ is the matrix obtained from $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C'',P)$ by multiplying by -1 the row and column of $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C'',P)$ corresponding to each $x \in V(F)$ such that the positions of x^- and x^+ in C' and C'' are different. Consequently if Δ is the diagonal matrix whose xx entry is 1 (resp. -1) when the positions of x^- and x^+ in C' and C'' are the same (resp. different), then $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P) = \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C'',P) \cdot \Delta$. Assertions (c) and (d) now follow from Corollary 20:

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C) = \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C'',C) \cdot \Delta = \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C'')^{-1} \cdot \Delta = \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,C')^{-1} \cdot \Delta$$

$$\begin{aligned} M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',P) &= \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C'',P) \cdot \Delta = \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C'',C) \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) \cdot \Delta \\ &= M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C',C) \cdot \Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C,P) \cdot \Delta \end{aligned}$$

■

Lauri [22] and Macris and Pulé [23] gave a formula for the number of Euler systems of F that respect the same edge directions. We close with a quick explanation of this important result.

Lemma 22 *Let C and C' be Euler systems of F, which respect the same set of edge directions. Then for any signed versions of C and C',*

$$\det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C') = 1.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $C' = C * (vw)$ and the signed versions of C and C' are related as in Proposition 19. Then Proposition 19 tells us how to obtain $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C', C') = I$ from $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$. The determinant is not affected by the row operations of part 3 of Proposition 19, and the row operations of parts 1 and 2 – interchanging the v and w rows, and multiplying one of these rows by -1 – both have the effect of multiplying the determinant by -1. We conclude that in this case $\det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C') = \det I = 1$.

If some other signed versions of C and C' are used, then the effect is to replace $M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C')$ with $\Delta \cdot M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, C') \cdot \Delta$, as in the proof of Corollary 21. As $\det \Delta = \pm 1$, this replacement does not change the determinant.

The general case follows from part 3 of Corollary 21 by induction, because C' can be obtained from C using some sequence of transpositions. ■

Corollary 23 *Let C be an Euler system of F, and P a circuit partition with $\psi_C(v) \neq P(v)\ \forall v \in V(F)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

1. *P is an Euler system.*
2. $\det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P) = 1$.
3. $\det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P) \neq 0$.
4. $\det \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P) = 1$.
5. $\det \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P) \neq 0$.

Proof. Lemma 22 gives us the implication $1 \Rightarrow 2$. The equality

$$M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P) = \begin{bmatrix} I & \mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P) \\ 0 & \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P) \end{bmatrix}$$

tells us that $\det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P) = \det \mathcal{I}_P(C, D)$, so we have $2 \Leftrightarrow 4$ and $3 \Leftrightarrow 5$. The implication $2 \Rightarrow 3$ is obvious. According to Theorem 6, condition 3 implies that every edge of $Tch(P)$ is a loop; this in turn implies that P is an Euler system. ■

Theorem 24 *(Lauri [22] and Macris and Pulé [23]) Let C be a signed version of an Euler system of F. Then the number of Euler systems of F that respect the edge directions defined by C is* $\det(I + \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C))$.

Proof. Let $v_1, ..., v_n$ be the vertices of F, and let $x_1, ..., x_n$ be independent indeterminates. For each subset $S \subseteq \{1, ..., n\}$, let P_S be the circuit partition of F that involves $\phi_C(v_i)$ whenever $i \in S$, and $\chi_C(v_i)$ whenever $i \notin S$. Let

$$\mathcal{E} = \{S \subseteq \{1, ..., n\} \mid P_S \text{ is an Euler system of } F\}.$$

Let X be the matrix with entries $x_1, ..., x_n$ on the diagonal, and other entries 0. Then Corollary 23 tells us that

$$\det(X + \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C)) = \sum_{S \subseteq \{1,...,n\}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} x_i \right) \det M^0_{\mathbb{R}}(C, P_S) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} x_i \right).$$

That is, $\det(X + \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{R}}(C))$ is a version of the indicator function of the set $\mathcal{E}$. The theorem follows by setting $x_1, ..., x_n$ equal to 1. ■

Theorem 24 implies that in polynomial time, one can calculate the number of Euler systems of F that respect the edge directions defined by C. Ge and Štefankovič [13] proved that in contrast, the problem of counting all the Euler systems of F is $\#P$-complete.

References

[1] R. Arratia, B. Bollobás, and G. B. Sorkin, *The interlace polynomial of a graph*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **92** (2004), 199-233.

[2] R. Arratia, B. Bollobás, and G. B. Sorkin, *A two-variable interlace polynomial*, Combinatorica **24** (2004), 567-584.

[3] I. Beck, *Cycle decomposition by transpositions*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **23** (1977), 198-207.

[4] I. Beck and G. Moran, *Introducing disjointness to a sequence of transpositions*, Ars Combin. **22** (1986), 145-153.

[5] B. Bollobás, *Modern Graph Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[6] A. Bouchet, *Caractérisation des symboles croisés de genre nul*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B **274** (1972), A724-A727.

[7] A. Bouchet, *Isotropic systems*, European J. Combin. **8** (1987), 231-244.

[8] A. Bouchet, *Graphic presentation of isotropic systems*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **45** (1988), 58-76.

[9] A. Bouchet, *Unimodularity and circle graphs*, Discrete Math. **66** (1987), 203-208.

[10] H. R. Brahana, *Systems of circuits on two-dimensional manifolds*, Ann. Math. **23** (1921), 144-168.

[11] R. Brijder and L. Traldi, *A characterization of circle graphs in terms of multimatroid representations*, preprint, arXiv:1703.05960 [math.CO].

[12] M. Cohn and A. Lempel, *Cycle decomposition by disjoint transpositions*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **13** (1972), 83-89.

[13] Q. Ge and D. Štefankovič, *The complexity of counting Eulerian tours in 4-regular graphs*, Algorithmica **63** (2012), 588–601.

[14] F. Jaeger, *On some algebraic properties of graphs*, in: *Progress in Graph Theory* (Waterloo, Ont., 1982), Academic Press, Toronto, 1984, pp. 347-366.

[15] J. Jonsson, *On the number of Euler trails in directed graphs*, Math. Scand. **90** (2002), 191-214.

[16] L. H. Kauffman, *State models and the Jones polynomial*, Topology **26** (1987), 395-407.

[17] J. Keir and R. B. Richter, *Walks through every edge exactly twice II*, J. Graph Theory **21** (1996), 301-309.

[18] A. Kotzig, *Eulerian lines in finite 4-valent graphs and their transformations*, in: *Theory of Graphs* (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966), Academic Press, New York, 1968, pp. 219-230.

[19] M. Las Vergnas, *On Eulerian partitions of graphs*, in: *Graph Theory and Combinatorics* (Proc. Conf., Open Univ., Milton Keynes, 1978), Res. Notes in Math., 34, Pitman, Boston, Mass.-London, 1979, pp. 62–75.

[20] M. Las Vergnas, *Eulerian circuits of 4-valent graphs imbedded in surfaces*, in: *Algebraic Methods in Graph Theory*, Vol. I, II (Szeged, 1978),

Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, 25, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1981, pp. 451–477.

[21] M. Las Vergnas, *Le polynôme de Martin d'un graphe Eulérien*, Ann. Discrete Math. **17** (1983), 397-411.

[22] J. Lauri, *On a formula for the number of Euler trails for a class of digraphs*, Discrete Math. **163** (1997), 307-312.

[23] N. Macris and J. V. Pulé, *An alternative formula for the number of Euler trails for a class of digraphs*, Discrete Math. **154** (1996), 301-305.

[24] P. Martin, *Enumérations eulériennes dans les multigraphes et invariants de Tutte-Grothendieck*, Thèse, Grenoble (1977).

[25] B. Mellor, *A few weight systems arising from intersection graphs*, Michigan Math. J. **51** (2003), 509-536.

[26] G. Moran, *Chords in a circle and linear algebra over GF(2)*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **37** (1984), 239-247.

[27] P. A. Pevzner, *DNA physical mapping and alternating Eulerian cycles in colored graphs*, Algorithmica **13** (1995) 77-105.

[28] R. C. Read and P. Rosenstiehl, *On the Gauss crossing problem*, in: *Combinatorics* (Proc. Fifth Hungarian Colloq., Keszthely, 1976), Vol. II, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, 18, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1978, pp. 843-876.

[29] R. B. Richter, *Walks through every edge exactly twice*, J. Graph Theory **18** (1994), 751-755.

[30] E. Soboleva, *Vassiliev knot invariants coming from Lie algebras and 4-invariants*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **10** (2001), 161-169.

[31] S. Stahl, *On the product of certain permutations*, European J. Combin. **8** (1987), 69-72.

[32] L. Traldi, *Binary nullity, Euler circuits and interlacement polynomials*, European J. Combin. **32** (2011), 944-950.

[33] L. Traldi, *On the linear algebra of local complementation*, Linear Alg. Appl. **436** (2012), 1072–1089.

[34] L. Traldi, *Interlacement in 4-regular graphs: a new approach using non-symmetric matrices*, Contrib. Discrete Math. **9** (2014), 85-97.

[35] E. Ukkonen, *Approximate string-matching with q-grams and maximal matches*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **92** (1992) 191-211.

[36] L. Zulli, *A matrix for computing the Jones polynomial of a knot*, Topology **34** (1995), 717-729.